REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Based on the examiner's comments in the Office action dated August 29, 2006, Claim 1 which does not satisfy the written description requirement is canceled. Claim 2 which is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention is also canceled. The examiner acknowledged that Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection under 35 U.S.C 112. 2nd paragraph set forth in the Office action, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 is now rewritten to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention that was originally presented for prosecution, and the claim language has been amended appropriately. Support for the rewritten claim can be found in the specification.

As claims 15 and 16 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention, under a restriction requirement made by the examiner in the present Office action, applicants retain the right to present these claims in a subsequent divisional application.

Applicants noticed that block 11 in the "Office Action Summary" was checked, but no explanatory note was attached, and therefore request clarification on the deficiency in the originally submitted declaration.

Applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SABINSA CORPORATION

By Spreder Dr. Subbalakshmi Prakash

VP Innovation & Business Development

Tel: (732) 777 1111

Typed or printed name of person mailing correspondence